REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the January 18, 2007 final Office Action regarding the above-identified application, and the claim amendments above together with these remarks are presented in a bona fide effort to respond thereto and address all issues raised in that Action. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By amendments above, Applicant has revised the claims, particularly so as to more clearly distinguish over applied art. Care has been taken to avoid introduction of new matter, and it is believed that support for the revised claims should be readily apparent throughout the original written description and drawings. However, it may be helpful to consider amended claim 9, by way of an example. In the revised claim, the address translation processing unit receives a packet containing management protocol data from a monitored apparatus on the private network. In the example shown in the application drawings, a packet like that of FIG. 2 contains SNMP data (PDU). As recited in the amended claim, the address translation processing unit translates a source address contained in the received packet into a virtual address, and the unit forms management protocol proxy data comprising the virtual address and the management protocol data. An example of the resulting management protocol proxy data is the lower portion or payload of the packet illustrated in application FIG. 3 (containing the translated SNMP source address as well as the SNMP PDU). In the revised claim, the assembly/disassembly processing unit generates a management protocol proxy data packet. This resulting "proxy" data packet includes the management protocol proxy data, an address of the management protocol proxy as a transmission source address, and an address of another management protocol proxy as a transmission destination address. Application FIG. 3, for example shows a packet of management protocol proxy data, wherein the new IP header contains the **proxy** source and destination addresses. The amended claim also recites an interproxy communication unit that

transmits the management protocol proxy data packet to the other management protocol proxy, i.e. the proxy designated by the transmission destination address of the proxy data packet, via the global network. A logical interproxy communication path 70 through the global network 10 appears in a number of the application drawings. The other independent claims have been revised in a somewhat similar manner, to refer to private, global and management address systems and to recite translation to a virtual address. Several dependent claims have been revised to conform to the language of the respective independent claims. In view of support in the original disclosure, as outlined above with regard to exemplary claim 9, it is submitted that the new revisions of the pending claims do not introduce new subject matter and find adequate written description and enabling support in the original papers. Entry of the claim amendments is earnestly solicited.

The latest Action included a rejection of claims 9-36 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. Essentially, the rejection asserted that the use of the phrase "defined by the NAT" in the context of the prior versions of the claims caused confusion. The phrase has been deleted, which should eliminate indefiniteness.

Claims 9-36 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable (misstated on page 6 as "anticipated") over U.S. Patent No. 6,581,108 to Denison et al. (hereinafter Denison) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,322 to Boden et al. (hereinafter Boden). Applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly distinguish over the proposed combination of Denison and Boden. Hence, the rejection is traversed on the ground that the combination does not meet the recitations of the amended claims and therefore does not establish unpatentability of any of the pending claims.

Although the claim scope varies, each of the independent claims (9, 19 and 28) now refers to a private network and a global network. The private and global networks are connected

13

via an Internet Protocol (IP) Network Address Translator (NAT) for translating between a private address system of the private network and a global address system of the global network. In each claim, there is a step or function that results in the formation of management protocol proxy data. This proxy data comprises management protocol data from a packet that the proxy received from a monitored apparatus on the private network. This proxy data also includes a virtual address obtained from translating a transmission source address contained in the received packet. The virtual address is an address belonging to a management address system, and that system is different from the private and global address systems. Operations also involve generating a management protocol proxy data packet, which includes the proxy data (including both the virtual address from the translation and the management protocol data from the received packet). The proxy data packet also includes an address of a management protocol **proxy** as a transmission source address and an address of another management protocol **proxy** as a transmission destination address. This proxy packet is transmitted to the other management protocol proxy designated by the transmission destination address, via the global network. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Denison and Boden does not meet all of the relevant recitations of the independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that Denison teaches translation of the header and the payload by a single address system. It is noted here that the Denison's translation of the header is performed by the router 104, that is, translation by the NAT. Denison's translation of the payload is performed by the MPAT 102. The MPAT 102 translates IP address related information contained in the payload of SNMP type management protocol packets "in order to retain consistency" (see e.g. column 1, lines 62-66; and column 2, lines 59-67). Thus, the translation by the MPAT 102 is apparently a translation using the same address system as the NAT. As such, there is only translation between a global address system and a private address

14

system, and there is no translation of a source address of a packet containing management protocol data received from a monitored apparatus on the private network into a virtual address belonging to a management address system, where the management address system is different from the private and global address systems, as recited in the claims. The first art rejection cites Boden for a teaching of translation to a virtual address, however, the Boden translation is a NAT translation to a virtual private network address, albeit in accord with rules that facilitate security. It is respectfully submitted that Boden would not lead one of skill in the art to modify Denison so as to translate Denison's payload data to a virtual address in a different address system. Hence, there is no teaching to translate the source address of a received packet containing management protocol data from a monitored apparatus to a virtual address in a management address system, form proxy data containing the virtual address and the management protocol data from the received packet, and then generate and transmit that proxy data via the global network in a proxy packet having proxy addresses as the source and destination addresses. Hence, the proposed combination of Boden and Denison would not meet the requirements of the amended claims.

Claim 9 also expressly requires that the initial packet is one received in the proxy and is transmitted from the proxy to another proxy. The translation, the formation of proxy data containing the virtual address and the original management protocol data, and the generation of a proxy packet containing the resulting proxy data and having source and destination addresses of this and another proxy are all functions performed by elements in the recited management protocol proxy. Denison does not describe the formation of the proxy packet for communication to another proxy, as claimed; and the virtual private network NAT translation of Boden does not make up for this deficiency. The Action cited to column 3, lines 28-30 of Denison to allegedly satisfy the assembly/disassembly unit recitations of claim 9 as well as the communication unit recitation of claim 9. However, instead of disclosing the recited generation function and the

associated transmission function of claim 9, the text in column 3, lines 28-30 of Denison reads in its entirety:

...An incoming packet is therefore sent from either the router 104 or the MPAT 102 to its original destination, in this case the network management platform 106.

As shown by the quotation, the actual cited text of Denison relates to processing of an incoming packet destined from the element 106 that the rejection identifies as the alleged proxy. This text is certainly not enough to teach receiving an initial packet in the proxy from a monitored apparatus on the local network, translating the source address of the received packet to a virtual address, forming proxy data containing that virtual address and the original management protocol data, generating a proxy packet containing the resulting proxy data and source and destination addresses of this and another proxy and then transmitting that proxy data packet to the other management protocol proxy. Since the rejection relies on Denison for the generation and transmission of the proxy packet, the proposed combination of Denison and Boden would fail to meet the relevant requirements of claim 9.

For the reasons outlined above relative to the independent claims, it is believed that all of the pending claims recite limitations not satisfied by the proposed combination of Denison and Boden. Hence, the pending claims should be patentable over those applied documents.

The Action also included a rejection of claims 9, 10, 14, 17-20, 27-30, 33 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,892,245 to Crump et al. (hereinafter Crump). The basic statement of the rejection and most of the subsequent explanation (paragraphs 11-17 of the detailed Action) rely solely on Crump albeit modified to purportedly meet the first and second address systems and NAT translation requirements of the former independent claims (top of page 10). Paragraph 18, in addressing claim 18, however, cites to

Boden for a secondary teaching with regard to a virtual address. Presumably, the Examiner intended to reject at least some claims over the modified system of Crump (paragraphs 11-17 of the detailed Action) further in view of Boden. It is respectfully submitted that Crump, whether taken alone or in combination with Boden, would not satisfy all aspects of the revised claims and this second and/or third rejection is traversed on that ground.

The pending claims patentably distinguish over Crump and over the combination of Crump with Boden. Claim 19 now recites steps comprising:

translating a transmission source address of a packet containing management protocol data received from a monitored apparatus on the private network to a virtual address belonging to a management address system different from the private and global address systems to form management protocol proxy data comprising the virtual address and the management protocol data;

generating a management protocol proxy data packet including the management protocol proxy data, an address of a management protocol proxy which is between the private and global networks as a transmission source address of the management protocol proxy data packet, and an address of another management protocol proxy as a transmission destination address of the management protocol proxy data packet; and

transmitting the management protocol proxy data packet to said another management protocol proxy designated by the transmission destination address, via the global network.

Claim 28 includes fairly similar steps, and elements of the proxy of claim 9 perform somewhat similar functions as discussed above. Crump relates to a multi-domain address translation (abstract), having DNS server and NAT implications. Contrary to the rejection, it is not seen how local DNS server correspond to management protocol proxies or how NAT or DNS translations perform functions similar to those quoted from claim 19 above in relation to management protocol data from a monitored device. The management protocol data and the receipt from the monitored device are positive recitations of the claims. The rejection, for example, has not identified any text where Crump discloses generating a proxy data packet from

a received packet containing management protocol data by: translating the source address of a received packet containing management protocol data from a monitored apparatus into a virtual address in a management address system, forming proxy data containing the virtual address and the management protocol data from the received packet, and then generating that proxy data for transmission via the global network in the data packet which has proxy addresses as the source and destination address. A teaching of a virtual private network address translation ala Boden would still not lead to a modification of the DNS or NAT functionality of Crump to result in a management protocol proxy, a proxy methodology or a proxy program product that would meet the amended claim limitations. Hence, neither Crump alone nor Crump in view of Boden would teach all aspects of Applicant's claims. The rejection(s) over Crump alone or in combination with Boden therefore should be overcome.

As outlined above, all of the pending claims now patentably distinguish over the art applied in the latest Office Action. Applicant therefore submits that all of the pending claims are novel and unobvious over the art of record. Favorable reconsideration is requested, and Applicant requests that the Examiner promptly issue a Notice of Allowability with respect to all of the pending claims.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the January 18, 2007 final Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8603 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 18, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

19